

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification was objected to. Claims 1, 3 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by Burns. Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 11 and 13 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Tang in view of Burns. Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tang in view of Burns and further in view of Naab.

The specification and claims have been amended and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 9 and 14 have been amended.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

The claims all now recite either that a portion of the hitching device extends from the first side, i.e. the side opposite the wheels, at the bottom of the carrier body or golf bag, or that the portion of the hitching device permits rotation of the carrier, as shown for example in Figs. 4 and 5 about axis F.

The positioning of a portion of the hitching device at the bottom of the carrier body permits the golf club carrier to have a low pivot or contact point to the golf car, which can make raising the golf club carrier as from the Fig. 5 to Fig. 4 position easier. The fact that the portion of the hitching device permits rotation also permits for easier attachment.

Neither Burns nor Tang nor Naab show such features.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections is thus respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
William C. Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940